

SAN JOSE, CA 95110-2731

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/764,010	01/22/2004		Eugene J. Alexander	6750-0007.02 SU98-U01.US1	8938
36806	7590	11/30/2005		EXAM	INER
		PEUTICS, INC.	JUNG, WILLIAM C		
c/o KENYON & KENYON 333 W, SAN CARLOS STREET				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 600			3737		

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Sp
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/764,010	ALEXANDER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	William Jung	3737
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated and the second part of the material part of	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	! January 2004.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	·	· •
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application	on.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement	
,	Giodion roquitomoni.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami		by the Evenines
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · ·	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn	= ' '	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	an priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	g. p y amaer ee ererer	3 () () .
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in A	Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	•	received in this National Stage
application from the International Bure	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Luna national
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ist of the certified copies not	received.
Attachment(s)		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

6) Other: _____.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,010

Art Unit: 3737

•••

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 2. Claims 1-33 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-33 of copending Application No. 09/882,363. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

 The claims 1-33 in current application is identical to claims 1-33 from US Application No. 09/882,363.
- 3. Claims 1-33 directed to the same invention as that of claims 1-33 of commonly assigned 09/882,363. The issue of priority under 35 U.S.C. 102(g) and possibly 35 U.S.C. 102(f) of this single invention must be resolved.

Since the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302), the assignee is required to state which entity is the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. A terminal disclaimer has no effect in this situation since the basis for refusing more than one patent is priority of invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and not an extension of monopoly.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,010

Art Unit: 3737

Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.
- 5. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter.

Named inventors in current application are Eugene J. Alexander, Thomas P. Andriacchi,
Philipp Land and Daniel Steines. The conflicting application described above in double
patenting rejection includes common inventors Eugene J. Alexander, Thomas P. Andriacchi, and
Philipp Lang, however, Sandy A. Napel is different from Daniel Steines.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Jung, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-4739. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,010

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 27, 2005

ALI IMAM PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 4